

number of bureaucrats who will be necessary to administer all the necessary services. Why not channel all these services into one service so that administration will not cost as much and so there will be fewer bureaucrats living like parasites on the backs of the people of this nation?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear'

**Mr. Rynard:** The minister himself admits that a much larger staff will be needed to administer this legislation. If Parkinson's law holds true, 5,000 additional employees will be taken on in the next couple of years.

**An hon. Member:** That is how the government will fight unemployment.

**Mr. Rynard:** This is like the front-end loading practised by some companies, only this time the government will be doing the front-end loading. Let us provide benefits for those who really need them. That is the only way to do it. It seems that we are to build a huge bureaucratic jungle to oversee our social programs. We are giving a bit here and a bit there through various departments of government. Why should not all this be done through one department? Let all benefits be paid by one cheque. Let there be one form to be filled out. In that way we could avoid creating the large bureaucracy which apparently is to be created and the people of this country could get value for their tax dollars.

• (2110)

[Translation]

**Mr. André Ouellet (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak at this stage in the proceedings on the motion of the New Democratic Party to the effect that Bill C-170 be not read now but that the government rather give consideration and I quote:

... to the introduction of legislation amending the Family Allowances Act and the Youth Allowances Act to provide for a substantial increase in the allowances paid thereunder, for continuing the principle of universality, and for related changes in the income tax legislation.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I call this motion of the NDP the joke of the century. Firstly, the proposal to substantially increase family allowances is made without any specific figures being given, while the government precisely proposes in Bill C-170 to double and even, in some cases, almost to triple the amount of family allowances.

Therefore, I ask members of the NDP whether they do not think this to be a very substantial increase already, and I ask them why they refuse to accept and acknowledge the effort made by the government to substantially increase family allowances.

Secondly,—

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Because it is an unfair legislation!

**Mr. Ouellet:** I will come to the remarks of the hon. member for Compton in a few minutes.

Secondly, I would like to say that the proposal of the NDP to preserve the principal of universality is an

### *Family Income Security Plan*

unbelievable position which seems to me particularly revealing at this time.

That socialist party which has always claimed to be the champion of oppressed and poor Canadians, now that it is given the opportunity to support a measure which is precisely going to help oppressed and poor people in Canada, proposes that this measure not be passed and that consideration of it be deferred.

I think this is completely inconsistent with what they have always advocated. Either they are hypocrites or they have betrayed the cause on account of which this party was created several years ago. And I should like to say that this attitude on the part of the New Democratic Party is very indicative of the fact that its members, under their new leader, are perhaps more concerned about the rich and the people with higher incomes who can afford high legal fees, than about the less privileged classes in our society.

I think that in recent years this government has clearly shown by introducing a whole series of measures and more particularly this proposal to substantially increase family allowances that it wants to bring about a more just society, that it wants to ensure a higher share of income and more generous government subsidies for the underprivileged. And when we ask the opposition to support this legislation, this party which is the self-proclaimed champion of the oppressed, objects to the bill. We shall remember this position and I am sure that the people will remember this reversal of attitude.

I would point out that social security in Canada is quite costly and amounts to about one quarter of each tax dollar. We have found it essential to help the lower income people and the poorest in our society. This is why we endeavoured to take steps to help those people but, while so doing, we recognized that we could no longer increase the burden of the Canadian taxpayers. To correct a situation which we deplored, we needed a better distribution of government expenditures and apply the principle of selectivity.

However, in the proposed motion, we are asked to perpetuate the principle of universality. This means simply that the opposition parties—the NDP supported by the Progressive Conservative Party and the Creditist Party—are prepared to keep on spending considerable amounts of money on people or families who do not need government assistance. In so doing, they are prepared to deprive the have-not families and people of a substantial increase which the present government wants to give them.

When one scrutinizes more closely the NDP's proposal, supported by a number of Social Credit members, one finds that while insisting on universality those members are in fact proposing selectivity. Indeed, they are suggesting universality of payments while in the same breath mentioning selectivity of allowances. This would be achieved by taxing these allowances on a basis which would allow for the recuperation of the total allowances paid to those enjoying a certain level of income. That is to say that the solution considered by the opposition parties only gives the illusion of universality and nothing more.

Moreover—and I think that the hon. members' attention should be drawn to this possibility—this suggestion